



MAIL STOP AF
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 2100

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: A.F. Istvan et al. Attorney Docket No.: DIGE123351
Application No.: 09/895,880 Art Unit: 2157 / Confirmation No.: 5380
Filed: June 28, 2001 Examiner: R. Osman
Title: INFORMATION ACCESS IN USER MODEL-BASED INTERACTIVE
TELEVISION

TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR RESPONSE
AFTER FINAL REJECTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Seattle, Washington 98101

December 19, 2005

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Response Transmittal

Transmitted herewith is a response to a Final Office Action in the above-identified application. No additional claim fee is required.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}

Kevan L. Morgan
Registration No. 42,015
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1712

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date:

12.19.2005

KLM/sdd

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100



MAIL STOP AF

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: A.F. Istvan et al. Attorney Docket No.: DIGE123351 (Digeo 139.2)
Application No.: 09/895,880 Art Unit: 2157 / Confirmation No. 5380
Filed: June 28, 2001 Examiner: R. Osman
Title: INFORMATION ACCESS IN USER MODEL-BASED INTERACTIVE
TELEVISION

RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Seattle, Washington 98101

December 19, 2005

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed October 19, 2005. In the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,945,988, issued to Williams et al. (hereinafter "Williams"). Claims 18-33, 35-38 and 40-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,704,864, issued to Philyaw (hereinafter "Philyaw"). Claims 4-6, 10-12, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Philyaw. Lastly, Claims 34, 39, and 44 were rejected as being unpatentable over Philyaw in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,523,067, issued to Mi et al. (hereinafter "Mi").

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. The Williams, Philyaw, and Mi references fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention recited in Claims 1-44. For the reasons discussed below, Claims 1-44 have not been amended and should be allowed.

Applicants note that the examiner handling this application has changed since the initial examination. To assist the new examiner in understanding the present application, applicants provide the following discussion of disclosed embodiments, after which applicants discuss in detail the reasons why Claims 1-44 are allowable. The following discussion of embodiments is provided for purposes of illustration and not to define the scope of any of the claims, nor is it

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100